

No. 4425	號五十二百四千四第	日四初月二十年未辛治同	HONGKONG, SATURDAY, 13TH JANUARY, 1873.	六拜禮 號三十月正英 港香	[PRICE \$2½ PER MONTH.]
----------	-----------	-------------	---	---------------	-------------------------

第四千四百二十五號

同治辛未年十二月初四日

HONGKONG, SATURDAY, 13TH JANUARY, 1872.

六拜禮 號三十月正英 港香

PRICE \$21 PER MONTH

... ..

Intimations.

HONGKONG CHORAL SOCIETY.

THE COMMITTEE ^{has} to announce that a
CONCERT
will be given by the MEMBERS of the above
SOCIETY
ON
M O N D A Y ,
the 15th instant;
AT
THE CITY HALL ,
to commence at 9 o'clock.

Tickets may be obtained at Messrs. LANE,
CRAWFORD & Co's.

Price, \$2.00 each.

The proceeds of the Concert will be given to
the fund in aid of the sufferers by the Chicago
Fire.

JAS. B. COUGHTRY,
Hon. Secretary.
51, Hongkong, 8th January, 1872.

FOR MANILA (direct).
The Steamship

"SUNSHINE,"

Captain Taylor, to arrive from Amoy about Tuesday, the 16th inst., will meet with quick despatch for the above Port.

For Freight or Passage, apply to
DOUGLAS LAURIAK & Co.
of 92 Hongkong, 13th January, 1872.

FOR SHANGHAI.

THE Steamship

"SUWONDA,"

Captain Clark, will be despatched for the above Port **TU-DAY, SATURDAY**, the 13th instant, at 4 P.M.

AUGUSTINE HEARD & Co.
93 Hongkong, 13th January, 1872.

"KEELUNG COAL" burns good fire for Small Engine Boilers and Household Fireplaces, at moderate prices. Persons requiring to purchase retailing quantities please apply to

WINGSHIN, HOPKEE & Co.,
No. 130, Praya West, near the Gasworks.
1-90 Hongkong 14th January 1872

LOST.

A SMALL, Black Dog, long haired, resembling a Sky Terrier, and answers to the name of "Wee Wee." A reward of \$5 will be given, if required.

RICHARD DEACON,
College Gardens.
178 Hongkong, 11th January, 1917.

**HONGKONG HOTEL COMPANY,
LIMITED.**

THE Half-Yearly MEETING of the Shareholders of the HONGKONG HOTEL COMPANY, LIMITED, will be held at the HONGKONG CLUB, on FRIDAY, 26th February, 1917, at half past three, P.M., for the purpose of Receiving the Report of the Directors and the Accounts for the past six months, and for the Election of Directors and auditors.

By Order of the Directors,

22d St Hongkong, 10th January, 1872. *Secretary.*

PUBLICATIONS.

THE CONSPIRACY CASE.

REGINA v. ABDOL MOUSSA AND NOOR
MAHOMED OAKISSA.

IN the Press, and will be published in a few days, in 8vo., price 50 cents, the recent

Messrs. LANE, UXFORD & Co.
 Borneo
 Messrs. CHESSON & WOODHALL, Bookellers,
 and
 Messrs. DOUGLASS JENNETTES & Co., Book-
 sellers
 at 85 Hongkong, 11th January, 1872.

W. COLLINS.
 G. SHIP CHANDLER.
 T. A. U.
 Shipping supplied on most reasonable Terms.
 3m 55 [Jan. 9]

DENT & CO.'S ESTATE.

on all Claims against the above Estate admitted by the Trustees, will be paid at their Office, No. 7, Pedder's Hill, on the First Day of August next.

at 1100 Hongkong, 27th June, 1871.

DOLLS! DOLLS!! DOLLS!!!

A SPLENDID COLLECTION of DOLLS, handsomely dressed.

Inspection is invited.

LANE, CRAWFORD & Co.
1st 67 Hongkong, 29th January, 1872

THE offices of the Cadernier, and His Excellency's Majesty's Consulate, have this notice been REMOVED to the premises formerly occupied by Messrs. MATCHES & Co., at the junction of GARDEN STREET, and the street of EDWARD SCHELLHASS & Co.

at 14 Hongkong, 2nd January, 1872.

Patrols to Consignees.

CONSIGNERS per O. S. B. Co's steamer "Patrolous" are hereby notified that the cargo is being discharged into Craft, & landed

ances it will lie at Consignee's risk. The cargo will be ready for delivery from Craft or Godown and after the 9th January, 1872.
Goods undelivered after 16th January, 1872, will be subject to Rent.
Bills of Lading will be countersigned by
BUTTERFIELD & SWIRE,
Agents.
7d 56 Hongkong, 8th January, 1872.
P. & O. S. N. CO.
FRANCIS ANDERSON & CO.

ONSIGNEES are requested to take immediate delivery of the undermentioned packages, ex various Steamers, now lying unladen in the Company's God-down.

1 Box Eggs	1 Case Samples.
M. Guillemain	1 Case Samples.
B 120	1 Box Sandries.
W. Boon	1 Box Sandries.
SH (in a house)	2 Cases Samples.
C 100 & 1/2 (in a diam.)	2 Cases Books.
Knocknock Moosance	1 Parcel Samples.
Merriem, Bonyon, Bonyon	1 Parcel Samples.
L 438	1 Case Silk.
Pease, Pease, Hono	1 Box Shells.
Malu	1 Parcel Sugar Samples.
Capitano del Puerto,	1 Box Books.
Manila	1 Parcel Samples.
531/6	1 Case Unknown.
Orange	1 Case Unknown.
C (in a diamond)	1 Case Samples.
A. McIver	Superintendent.

At 42, Hongkong, 4th January, 1872.

The Chronicle and Directory for 1912.

NOW READY.

THIS Work, now in the TENTH year of its existence, is ready for delivery. It has been completely reprinted, and the Daily Press Office, having the best and most up-to-date, and no pains have been spared to make the work complete in all respects.

In addition to the usual rates and voluminous information, the value of the "CHRONICLE AND DIRECTORY FOR 1912" will be further augmented by the addition of a Chromo-lithograph plate of the NEW CODE OF SIGNALS IN USE AT THE PEAK.

THE VARIOUS HOUSE FLAGS

(Designed expressly for this Work.)
MAPS OF HONGKONG, JAPAN, AND THE COAST OF CHINA.

The Directory will be published in Two Forms, Complete at \$5, or with the Lists of Residents, Port Directors, Maps, &c., at \$3.

Orders for Copies may be sent to the Daily Press Office, or to the following Agents:

Singapore, Mr. PATRICK CAMPBELL.
Amoy, Messrs. WATSON, NEILL & Co.
Batavia, Messrs. WATSON, NEILL & Co.
Bombay, Messrs. WATSON, NEILL & Co.
Calcutta, Messrs. WATSON, NEILL & Co.
Canton, Messrs. WATSON, NEILL & Co.
Cebu, Messrs. WATSON, NEILL & Co.
Colon, Messrs. WATSON, NEILL & Co.
Hankow, Messrs. WATSON, NEILL & Co.
Harbin, Messrs. WATSON, NEILL & Co.
Hongkong, Messrs. WATSON, NEILL & Co.
Kobe, Messrs. WATSON, NEILL & Co.
Lyons, Messrs. WATSON, NEILL & Co.
Manila, Messrs. WATSON, NEILL & Co.
Peking, Messrs. WATSON, NEILL & Co.
Rangoon, Messrs. WATSON, NEILL & Co.
San Francisco, Messrs. WATSON, NEILL & Co.
Shanghai, Messrs. WATSON, NEILL & Co.
Singapore, Messrs. WATSON, NEILL & Co.
Sourabaya, Messrs. WATSON, NEILL & Co.
Tientsin, Messrs. WATSON, NEILL & Co.
Yokohama, Messrs. WATSON, NEILL & Co.

The driver of the Daily Press from this office commences on Friday morning at 6.55, and the last messenger leaves at 10.15.

The Daily Press.

HONGKONG, JANUARY 18th, 1912.

With reference to recent judicial arrangements in this Colony, it may not be inappropriate to refer to two late cases in which the Lord Chancellor's appointments to judgeships have been the subject of much criticism at home. The appointment of Sir ROBERT COLLIER, the late Attorney-General, to the position of a paid member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, has called forth a protest from the Lord Chief Justice, Sir A. COCKBURN, on the ground that the Act of Parliament requiring such members to be elected from amongst the Judges of the land, is evaded by the elevation of the Attorney-General to a puisne judgeship in order to qualify him to be immediately appointed to the Judicial Committee. The only argument put forward on behalf of the Government is that none of the Judges would accept the position, and that therefore Lord HATFIELD was in a dilemma from which he could only extricate himself by recourse to an expedient which no one denies was colourably evasive. This argument is disposed of by the *Pall Mall Gazette*, which shows that it would have been easy to make the post worth the acceptance of the men whose judicial experience, and not their mere judgeships, is wanted in the Judicial Committee. In reading of this energetic and authoritative protest, a dweller in Hongkong may possibly be a little surprised that after all there was nothing more serious in the matter than that an eminent member of the bar was raised to an important judgeship rather more suddenly than was contemplated by the Act of Parliament. Why, that is nothing. If Sir ALEXANDER COCKBURN wants to protest, he had better look away from home a little. A transaction which passed here without protest from the Chief Justice of Hongkong would have been subject for protest. Did Sir A. COCKBURN ever hear of Judge MacDONNELL appointed to the position of Attorney-General, and being licensed thereby to practise privately as a barrister at the very time that he was fulfilling his judicial duties? And yet such things can be on the remote side of the earth, if the Governor be absent: happily, on his arrival, this little breach of etiquette was repaired. The exorbitant of the Government of course was that there was no one else to appoint, there being only one other barrister in the Colony, and the traditions and usages of our Supreme Court rendering it absolutely necessary that every author be represented by counsel. If there had been no other barrister in the colony, it would have been far better to dispense altogether with the Attorney-General than to construct him out of a Judge. A solicitor might have conducted the prosecutions, and surely we are not so tied to form as to render the name of an Attorney-General at the foot of an information indispensable. If so, we could have borne the temporary appointment of a Judge. But as matters actually stood, there was no necessity for such a measure. There was a barrister here, and if he had been appointed, so long as there was no other practicing barrister a solicitor would have appeared on the other side of any case as a matter of right and of course. When Sir RICHARD MACDONNELL arrived, the difficulty had vanished, another barrister having appeared in the interim. If this had not been so, it may be questioned whether the scandal would have been so promptly removed, and therefore it is that in view of even more difficult circumstances in the future (supposing for instance that there were no counsel in the Colony, but the Judges) that it is necessary to insist on the principle that a Judge must not under any circumstances whatever be come an advocate. The difficulty with respect to Judge BALL, the late Acting Attorney-General, being thus removed by his "resignation," the next surprise to which we are treated is the temporary appointment of the Acting Attorney-General, Mr. HATFIELD, to the bench of the Summary Court. Here then the evil, it may be said, repeats itself, and so in a measure it does, though it is well to bear in mind that the appointment of an advocate to a temporary judgeship differs somewhat from that of a Judge to a temporary position at the bar. But though less in

degree, the abuse is the same in character, and can only be justified by proof of urgent necessity. Now we do not think there is any such necessity. The Chief Justice goes home on leave, and Mr. BALL acts in his absence. This may be said, but the Summary Court is left empty. Why should this be? Why should Mr. BALL not in both capacities. There is more harmony, surely, between the duties of Judge of the Supreme and Summary Courts, than between those of Judge and Attorney-General. There is one reason, of course, why, if it can be avoided, the same Judge should not occupy the two benches; that is, that the appeal which lies from the inferior Court to the Chief Justice becomes under these circumstances a dead letter. But as matters now stand, to whom do the parties of the Summary Court appeal? To Acting Chief Justice BALL. Can it then be wrong that he should hear their cases in the first instance, and appeal be temporarily abolished, so that the appeal should be made only in any way less desirable, but if it were so, can it be supposed that so trifling a preponderance of disadvantage could possibly outweigh the very serious inconveniences of Mr. HATFIELD's appointment to the bench, however well qualified that gentleman may be for such a post did he not already hold that of Acting Attorney-General?

The other appointment of Lord HATFIELD, which has been criticised in the English papers is that of Mr. H. Cox to a County Court judgeship in Wales, the sole objection to it being that the new Judge does not understand Welsh. It appears that it has been usual to appoint native barristers to the Welsh County Courts' benches, and the present change is deprecated by a Welsh M.P., Mr. OSBORNE MORRIS, and not very favourably viewed by some of the journals. The only bearing this question has upon local affairs is to show how extremely desirable it would be, if it were possible, that our judges should be able to speak Chinese. But however desirable, it is one of those good things that we are not likely to realise until we take possession of a province of China, and train our own China-born barristers. One thing, however, may be noted, as illustrated by both the cases we have been considering, and that is, that judicial appointments at home are most carefully scrutinised, and that not the least far in any one of them escapes notice, and if need be, protest. This is one of the elements which go together to make the English Bench what it is, and it is therefore one which should never be dispensed with. In a Colony situated as this one is, the public need be doubly watchful of such appointments, because the difficulties that beset the Government in making them render it easy to plausibly excuse the most objectionable features of them. These difficulties, to be remembered, are of the Government's own making. If the distinction between the castles of barrister and solicitor, which is locally obstructive and unnecessary, had not been perpetuated in our Statute-book, no difficulties could arise. They do not arise in H.B.M. Supreme Court in China and Japan, partly because that distinction is virtually abolished. If, therefore, there are difficulties, we should, rather than submit to objectionable appointments, force the Government, so far as we can, into those difficulties, with the view of getting them done away.

It will have been noticed that the Colonial Society is to give a Concert on Monday in aid of the Chinese Relief Funds. Apart from the fact that the Society is a very old one, and that it has a long and distinguished history, the fact that it has been selected for performance, and partly from the acknowledged skill and indefatigable energy of the recently elected Conductor as regards the choruses, and the well-known musical powers of the soloists, as regards those parts which are not Choral, the Society's programme is a very attractive one. The first part of the programme, and the second part will be devoted to solo, duet, and quartet songs. Altogether the prospects of the Concert are excellent, and for every reason there ought to be a crowded room on Monday evening.

We hear with great pleasure that H.B. the Governor has instructed the Acting Attorney-General to give his attention to a view to suppress the intolerable nuisances of street trading, and to see that the streets are kept clear of the obnoxious and unsightly objects which are so much a feature of the Colony. The Acting Attorney-General, who is a very capable and energetic man, and who has been appointed to the position of Attorney-General, and being licensed thereby to practise privately as a barrister at the very time that he was fulfilling his judicial duties? And yet such things can be on the remote side of the earth, if the Governor be absent: happily, on his arrival, this little breach of etiquette was repaired. The exorbitant of the Government of course was that there was no one else to appoint, there being only one other barrister in the Colony, and the traditions and usages of our Supreme Court rendering it absolutely necessary that every author be represented by counsel. If there had been no other barrister in the colony, it would have been far better to dispense altogether with the Attorney-General than to construct him out of a Judge. A solicitor might have conducted the prosecutions, and surely we are not so tied to form as to render the name of an Attorney-General at the foot of an information indispensable. If so, we could have borne the temporary appointment of a Judge. But as matters actually stood, there was no necessity for such a measure. There was a barrister here, and if he had been appointed, so long as there was no other practicing barrister a solicitor would have appeared on the other side of any case as a matter of right and of course. When Sir RICHARD MACDONNELL arrived, the difficulty had vanished, another barrister having appeared in the interim. If this had not been so, it may be questioned whether the scandal would have been so promptly removed, and therefore it is that in view of even more difficult circumstances in the future (supposing for instance that there were no counsel in the Colony, but the Judges) that it is necessary to insist on the principle that a Judge must not under any circumstances whatever be come an advocate. The difficulty with respect to Judge BALL, the late Acting Attorney-General, being thus removed by his "resignation," the next surprise to which we are treated is the temporary appointment of the Acting Attorney-General, Mr. HATFIELD, to the bench of the Summary Court. Here then the evil, it may be said, repeats itself, and so in a measure it does, though it is well to bear in mind that the appointment of an advocate to a temporary judgeship differs somewhat from that of a Judge to a temporary position at the bar. But though less in

degree, the abuse is the same in character, and can only be justified by proof of urgent necessity. Now we do not think there is any such necessity. The Chief Justice goes home on leave, and Mr. BALL acts in his absence. This may be said, but the Summary Court is left empty. Why should this be? Why should Mr. BALL not in both capacities. There is more harmony, surely, between the duties of Judge of the Supreme and Summary Courts, than between those of Judge and Attorney-General. There is one reason, of course, why, if it can be avoided, the same Judge should not occupy the two benches; that is, that the appeal which lies from the inferior Court to the Chief Justice becomes under these circumstances a dead letter. But as matters now stand, to whom do the parties of the Summary Court appeal? To Acting Chief Justice BALL. Can it then be wrong that he should hear their cases in the first instance, and appeal be temporarily abolished, so that the appeal should be made only in any way less desirable, but if it were so, can it be supposed that so trifling a preponderance of disadvantage could possibly outweigh the very serious inconveniences of Mr. HATFIELD's appointment to the bench, however well qualified that gentleman may be for such a post did he not already hold that of Acting Attorney-General?

The other appointment of Lord HATFIELD, which has been criticised in the English papers is that of Mr. H. Cox to a County Court judgeship in Wales, the sole objection to it being that the new Judge does not understand Welsh. It appears that it has been usual to appoint native barristers to the Welsh County Courts' benches, and the present change is deprecated by a Welsh M.P., Mr. OSBORNE MORRIS, and not very favourably viewed by some of the journals. The only bearing this question has upon local affairs is to show how extremely desirable it would be, if it were possible, that our judges should be able to speak Chinese. But however desirable, it is one of those good things that we are not likely to realise until we take possession of a province of China, and train our own China-born barristers. One thing, however, may be noted, as illustrated by both the cases we have been considering, and that is, that judicial appointments at home are most carefully scrutinised, and that not the least far in any one of them escapes notice, and if need be, protest. This is one of the elements which go together to make the English Bench what it is, and it is therefore one which should never be dispensed with. In a Colony situated as this one is, the public need be doubly watchful of such appointments, because the difficulties that beset the Government in making them render it easy to plausibly excuse the most objectionable features of them. These difficulties, to be remembered, are of the Government's own making. If the distinction between the castles of barrister and solicitor, which is locally obstructive and unnecessary, had not been perpetuated in our Statute-book, no difficulties could arise. They do not arise in H.B.M. Supreme Court in China and Japan, partly because that distinction is virtually abolished. If, therefore, there are difficulties, we should, rather than submit to objectionable appointments, force the Government, so far as we can, into those difficulties, with the view of getting them done away.

We hear with great pleasure that H.B. the Governor has instructed the Acting Attorney-General to give his attention to a view to suppress the intolerable nuisances of street trading, and to see that the streets are kept clear of the obnoxious and unsightly objects which are so much a feature of the Colony. The Acting Attorney-General, who is a very capable and energetic man, and who has been appointed to the position of Attorney-General, and being licensed thereby to practise privately as a barrister at the very time that he was fulfilling his judicial duties? And yet such things can be on the remote side of the earth, if the Governor be absent: happily, on his arrival, this little breach of etiquette was repaired. The exorbitant of the Government of course was that there was no one else to appoint, there being only one other barrister in the Colony, and the traditions and usages of our Supreme Court rendering it absolutely necessary that every author be represented by counsel. If there had been no other barrister in the colony, it would have been far better to dispense altogether with the Attorney-General than to construct him out of a Judge. A solicitor might have conducted the prosecutions, and surely we are not so tied to form as to render the name of an Attorney-General at the foot of an information indispensable. If so, we could have borne the temporary appointment of a Judge. But as matters actually stood, there was no necessity for such a measure. There was a barrister here, and if he had been appointed, so long as there was no other practicing barrister a solicitor would have appeared on the other side of any case as a matter of right and of course. When Sir RICHARD MACDONNELL arrived, the difficulty had vanished, another barrister having appeared in the interim. If this had not been so, it may be questioned whether the scandal would have been so promptly removed, and therefore it is that in view of even more difficult circumstances in the future (supposing for instance that there were no counsel in the Colony, but the Judges) that it is necessary to insist on the principle that a Judge must not under any circumstances whatever be come an advocate. The difficulty with respect to Judge BALL, the late Acting Attorney-General, being thus removed by his "resignation," the next surprise to which we are treated is the temporary appointment of the Acting Attorney-General, Mr. HATFIELD, to the bench of the Summary Court. Here then the evil, it may be said, repeats itself, and so in a measure it does, though it is well to bear in mind that the appointment of an advocate to a temporary judgeship differs somewhat from that of a Judge to a temporary position at the bar. But though less in

POLICE INTELLIGENCE.

January 18th.

REPORE C. MAY, ESQ.
Mr. A. McDONNELL, of the West Point Slip, summoned a printer on a charge of stealing the name of a post office, and the printer, who was a Chinese, was found guilty and sentenced to three months' imprisonment.

SHOCKING EXERCISE CASE.
The case of Mrs. MORTON, private of H. M. Army, charged with cutting and wounding a Chinese boy, came on yesterday, and the prisoner was committed for trial at the session of the Supreme Court.

SHOCKING EXERCISE CASE.
The case of Mrs. MORTON, private of H. M. Army, charged with cutting and wounding a Chinese boy, came on yesterday, and the prisoner was committed for trial at the session of the Supreme Court.

SHOCKING EXERCISE CASE.
The case of Mrs. MORTON, private of H. M. Army, charged with cutting and wounding a Chinese boy, came on yesterday, and the prisoner was committed for trial at the session of the Supreme Court.

THE GOVERNMENT DISTRICT COURT.

The Government District Court, which appeared again on one of the usual occasions, this time held a session to remove the rubbish from the streets, and the Court was held in the morning.

Some further cases of nuisance, &c., completed the day's proceedings.

VICE-ADMIRALTY COURT.

Before the Hon. H. J. RALL.

The "Sea-Shell" v. the "Niger".
The impugned proctors, Messrs. Sharp and Toller, applied for the production of the bill of costs. The interesting ceremony was conducted in silence.

SUPREME COURT.

In Chambers.

Before the Hon. H. J. RALL.

Remond v. Reynolds.

This was a bill filed by the defendant, in the case of Reynolds v. Remond, for an injunction to restrain the plaintiff from proceeding with the Common Law action.

The Acting Attorney-General, instructed by Messrs. Sharp and Toller, appeared for Mr. Reynolds, and Mr. Drummond, instructed by Messrs. Oldfield and Beaton, appeared for Mr. Remond.

Mr. Drummond said that the plaintiff, Remond, entered the service of the defendant, Reynolds, in June, 1885, and continued acting as such until October, 1885, when Mr. Reynolds left for the Philippines, leaving the plaintiff in charge of his business in Hongkong. He also gave him a letter dated 26th October, 1885, and a power of attorney.

His Lordship asked why this case had come into Equity.

Mr. Drummond said that the bill had been filed by Mr. Remond, on the ground that he had not received his salary for the period of his service, and that he was entitled to it.

His Lordship said that this was a very unsatisfactory mode of dealing with the matter, as the question was one of money, and not of equity.

Mr. Drummond went on to say that the plaintiff had charged different sums at different rates as salary during his time of service.

On the 30th June, 1885, he charged salary for the last October, 1885, to date, 9 months at \$1,500 per month, \$1,125; on the 31st December, 1885, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; on the 30th June, 1886, six months salary at the same rate, \$750; on the 31st December, 1886, there was an entry of salary for the year, 1886 to September, 1887, \$5,500. In April, 1887, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1887, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1887, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1888, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1888, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1888, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1889, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1889, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1889, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1890, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1890, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1890, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1891, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1891, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1891, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1892, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1892, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1892, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1893, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1893, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1893, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1894, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1894, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1894, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1895, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1895, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1895, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1896, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1896, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1896, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1897, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1897, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1897, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1898, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1898, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1898, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1899, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1899, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1899, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1900, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1900, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1900, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1901, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1901, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1901, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1902, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1902, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1902, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1903, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1903, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1903, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1904, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1904, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1904, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1905, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1905, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1905, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1906, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1906, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1906, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1907, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1907, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1907, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1908, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1908, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1908, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1909, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1909, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1909, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1910, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1910, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1910, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1911, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1911, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1911, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1912, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1912, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1912, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1913, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1913, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1913, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1914, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1914, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1914, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1915, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1915, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1915, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1916, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1916, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1916, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1917, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1917, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1917, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1918, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1918, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1918, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1919, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1919, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1919, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1920, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1920, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1920, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1921, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1921, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1921, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1922, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1922, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1922, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1923, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1923, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1923, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1924, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1924, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1924, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1925, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1925, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1925, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1926, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1926, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1926, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1927, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1927, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1927, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1928, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1928, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1928, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1929, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1929, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1929, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1930, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1930, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1930, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1931, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1931, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1931, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1932, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1932, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1932, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1933, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1933, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1933, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1934, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1934, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1934, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1935, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1935, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1935, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1936, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1936, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1936, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1937, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1937, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1937, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1938, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1938, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1938, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1939, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1939, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1939, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1940, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1940, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1940, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1941, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1941, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1941, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1942, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1942, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1942, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1943, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1943, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1943, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1944, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1944, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1944, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1945, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1945, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1945, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1946, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1946, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1946, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1947, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1947, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1947, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1948, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1948, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1948, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1949, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1949, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1949, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1950, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1950, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1950, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1951, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1951, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1951, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1952, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1952, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1952, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1953, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1953, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1953, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1954, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1954, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1954, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1955, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1955, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1955, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1956, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1956, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1956, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1957, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1957, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1957, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1958, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1958, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1958, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1959, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1959, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1959, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1960, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1960, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1960, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1961, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1961, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1961, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1962, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1962, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1962, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1963, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1963, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1963, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1964, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1964, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1964, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1965, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1965, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1965, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1966, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1966, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1966, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1967, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1967, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1967, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1968, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1968, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1968, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1969, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1969, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1969, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1970, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1970, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1970, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1971, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1971, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1971, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1972, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1972, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1972, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1973, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1973, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in December, 1973, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in April, 1974, he charged salary for the same rate, \$750; in August, 1974, he charged salary for the

